



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

SHERIDAN ROSS PC
1560 BROADWAY
SUITE 1200
DENVER, CO 80202

COPY MAILED

MAR 3 1 2005

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of
Van Doren et al.
Application No. 10/666,433
Filed: September 18, 2003
Attorney Docket No. 3944-13-CIP

:
:
: DECISION GRANTING PETITION
: UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) AND
: UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6)

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6), filed February 11, 2005, to accept an unintentionally delayed claim under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and 119(e) for the benefit of the prior-filed applications set forth in the concurrently filed amendment.

The petitions are **DISMISSED**.

A petition for acceptance of a claim for late priority under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) is only applicable to those applications filed on or after November 29, 2000. Further, the petition is appropriate only after the expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and 1.78(a)(5)(ii). In addition, the petition under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) must be accompanied by:

- (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and 119(e) and 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(i) and 1.78(a)(5)(i) of the prior-filed application, unless previously submitted;
- (2) the surcharge set forth in § 1.17(t); and
- (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and 1.78(a)(5)(ii) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional.

Intermediate nonprovisional Application No. 10/102,614 was filed within twelve months of provisional Application No. 60/278,034, which was filed on March 21, 2001, for which priority is claimed. A reference to the prior-filed applications has been included in an amendment to the first sentence of the specification following the title.

However, the amendment is not acceptable as drafted since it improperly incorporates by reference the prior-filed applications. Petitioner's attention is directed to Dart Industries v. Banner, 636 F.2d 684, 207 USPQ 273 (C.A.D.C. 1980), where the court drew a distinction between a permissible 35 U.S.C. § 120 statement and the impermissible introduction of new matter by way of incorporation by reference in a 35 U.S.C. § 120 statement. The court specifically stated:

Section 120 merely provides a mechanism whereby an application becomes entitled to benefit of the filing date of an earlier application disclosing the same subject matter. Common subject matter must be disclosed, in both applications, either specifically or by an express incorporation-by-reference of prior disclosed subject matter. Nothing in section 120 itself operates to carry forward any disclosure from an earlier application. In re deSeversky, supra at 674, 177 USPQ at 146-147. Section 120 contains no magical disclosure-augmenting powers able to pierce new matter barriers. It cannot, therefore, "limit" the absolute and express prohibition against new matter contained in section 251.

In order for the incorporation by reference statement to be effective as a proper safeguard against the omission of a portion of a prior application, the incorporation by reference statement must be included in the specification-as-filed, or in an amendment specifically referred to in an oath or declaration executing the application. See In re deSeversky, *supra*. Note also MPEP 201.06(c).

Accordingly, before the petition under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) can be granted, a substitute amendment¹ deleting the incorporation by reference statement, along with a renewed petition under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6), is required.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail: Mail Stop PETITIONS
 Commissioner for Patents
 Post Office Box 1450
 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By hand: Customer Window located at:
 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
 Customer Service Window Randolph Building
 401 Dulany Street
 Alexandria, VA 22314

By fax: (703) 872-9306
 ATTN: Office of Petitions

Any questions concerning this matter may be directed to Paralegal Liana Chase at (571) 272-3206.



Frances Hicks
Petitions Examiner
Office of Petitions
Office of the Deputy Commissioner
for Patent Examination Policy

¹ Note 37 CFR 1.121